

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The rejections presented in the Office Action dated March 10, 2008, (hereinafter Office Action) have been considered. Reconsideration of the pending claims and allowance of the application in view of the present response is respectfully requested.

With respect to the objection to the Specification, Applicant respectfully traverses. The objection is based upon the assertion that the Specification does not provide proper antecedent basis for the term “computer-readable medium”. First, it is noted that the subject matter of a claim need not be described literally in the Specification (*i.e.*, using the same terms or *in haec verba*) and an applicant is not limited to the nomenclature used in the application as filed. MPEP §§ 608.01(o) and 2163.01. Second, antecedent basis for the claimed medium is believed to be provided in the original Specification, for example, at page 47, line 1 *et seq.* This portion discloses that computer-readable program code may be embodied within one or more computer-usable media. A skilled artisan would recognize that in order to be computer-usable, the media must be computer-readable. Since the Specification discloses storage of computer program instructions on physical media and provides examples of storage media that constitute statutory subject matter, the Specification is believed to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed computer-readable medium. Applicant accordingly requests that the objection be removed.

Applicant respectfully traverses each of the prior art rejections (§§ 102(e) and 103(a)), each of which is based upon the teachings of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,219 to Vilander *et al.* (hereinafter “Vilander”), because Vilander does not teach or suggest each of the claimed limitations. For example, Vilander does not teach a network service broker comprising at least one-terminal coupled broker to communicate directly with one or more terminals, as claimed at least in independent Claims 1, 18, 30, 33, 40, and 41. While the cited base stations 5 of Vilander may communicate directly with terminal 9, the base stations have not been shown to be a network service broker with a loosely-coupled interface exposed to a service provision infrastructure. Rather, the base stations are taught as only interfacing with a radio network controller. Also, a combination of Vilander’s radio network controller with the base stations would not correspond to the claimed network service broker at least in that the radio network controller is a separate entity and does not comprise the base stations. Moreover, the base stations have not been shown to comprise a loosely-coupled interface, as claimed.

The multiple assertions that the interface inherently exists between the base stations and the access server in order for the two to communicate is unsupported and incorrect. First, no explanation or evidence has been provided in support of such an assertion. Applicant notes that the fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic. *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 1534, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1957 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Oelrich*, 666 F.2d 578, 581-82, 212 USPQ 323, 326 (CCPA 1981). Also, MPEP § 2112 states that “To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence ‘must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient.’” *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (citations omitted). Second, while there may be an interface between the base stations and the access server, there is no suggestion that such an interface would be a loosely-coupled interface as claimed. Rather, the interface could be an Iub interface. Thus, the assertion of inherency is unsupported and fails to provide correspondence to each of the claimed limitations.

In addition, the Office Action fails to assert or present correspondence to several claim limitations of independent Claims 34, 38, and 39. For example, no teachings have been identified in Vilander that would correspond to providing a use authorization voucher to a visited network service broker associated with a visited network (*e.g.*, Claim 34), communicating between a home network service broker and a visited network service broker associated with a visited network, wherein the home network service broker serves as a proxy in accessing the service functionality available via the visited network (*e.g.*, Claim 38), and facilitating access by a service provision infrastructure to the service functionality available from a visited network via the loosely-coupled interface of the visited network service broker (*e.g.*, Claim 39). Without an assertion or presentation of correspondence to each of the claimed limitations, the prior art rejections are improper.

With particular respect to the § 102(e) rejection, Applicant notes that to anticipate a claim the asserted reference must teach every element of the claim. “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently

described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the patent claim; *i.e.* every element of the claimed invention must be literally present, arranged as in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Therefore, all claim elements, and their limitations, must be found in the prior art reference to maintain the rejection based on 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicant respectfully submits that Vilander does not teach every element of independent Claims 1, 18, 30, 33, 34, 38, 39, and 41 in the requisite detail and therefore fails to at least anticipate Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 11, 18-22, 25, 27-39, and 41. Applicant accordingly requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2, 6, 8, 11, 19-22, 25, 27-29, 31, 32, and 35-37 depend from independent Claims 1, 18, 30, and 34, respectively, and also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Vilander. While Applicant does not acquiesce with the particular rejections to these dependent claims, these rejections are also improper for the reasons discussed above in connection with the independent claims. These dependent claims include all of the limitations of their respective base claims and any intervening claims and recite additional features which further distinguish these claims from the cited reference. Therefore, the rejection of dependent Claims 2, 6, 8, 11, 19-22, 25, 27-29, 31, 32, and 35-37 is improper, and Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

With further respect to the § 103(a) rejections of Claims 3-5, 9, 10, 12-17, 23, 24, 26, and 40 based upon modifications of Vilander with the teachings of 2003/0013434 by Rosenberg *et al.* (hereinafter “Rosenberg”) and U.S. Publication No. 2002/0154642 by Hagirahim *et al.* (hereinafter “Hagirahim”), Applicant respectfully traverses. As discussed above, Vilander fails to correspond to several of the claimed limitations of the independent claims. The further reliance on Rosenberg and Hagirahim does not overcome the above-discussed deficiencies in Vilander at least because neither reference has been shown to teach or suggest a network service broker, as claimed. Thus, the asserted combinations of the teachings of Vilander with Rosenberg and Hagirahim do not teach each of the limitations of Claims 3-5, 9, 10, 12-17, 23, 24, 26, and 40 and the rejections should be withdrawn.

It should be noted that Applicant does not acquiesce to the Examiner’s statements or conclusions concerning what would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art,

obvious design choices, common knowledge at the time of Applicant's invention, officially noticed facts, and the like. Applicant reserves the right to address in detail the Examiner's characterizations, conclusions, and rejections in future prosecution.

Moreover, independent Claims 1, 18, 30, 33, and 34 have been amended to shorten the preambles and further amendments to Claims 1, 18, 30, and 33 characterize that the claimed service provision infrastructure is configured to interface with a type of system different from the claimed terminals. Support for these changes may be found in the Specification, for example, at page 13, line 8 *et seq.*, and in Fig. 18 and the corresponding discussion thereof; therefore, these changes do not introduce new matter. Also, these changes are not made for any reasons related to patentability or to the asserted references since these claims, with or without the changes, are believed to be patentable over the teachings of Vilander, Rosenberg, and Hagirahim for the reasons set forth above.

Authorization is given to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3581 (NOKM.015CIP) any necessary fees for this filing. If the Examiner believes it necessary or helpful, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss any issues related to this case.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLINGSWORTH & FUNK, LLC
8009 34th Avenue South, Suite 125
Minneapolis, MN 55425
952.854.2700

Date: September 10, 2008

By: 

Erin M. Nichols
Reg. No. 57,125